

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The rejection presented in the Office Action dated March 20, 2007 (hereinafter Office Action) has been considered but is believed to be improper. Reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully traverses the §102(e) rejection based upon the teachings of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0190960 by Jokipii *et al.* (hereinafter “Jokipii”) because Jokipii does not teach or suggest each of the claimed limitations. For example, Jokipii does not teach displaying an alarm on a display of the device when the gaming session is due, as claimed. The claimed invention is directed to a single electronic gaming device. While cited paragraph [0041] teaches that players are invited to a tournament round via a message sent to each player, the players’ devices are not the electronic device asserted as corresponding to the claimed electronic gaming device where a gaming calendar is provided and stored. Rather, the relied-upon interface shown in Fig. 5 is displayed on a league administrator’s device (paragraph [0036]), and there is no indication that the league administrator’s device receives such a message. Moreover, there is no teaching that Jokipii’s message includes a query, as claimed. Without a presentation of correspondence to each of the claimed limitations, the §102(e) rejection is improper.

Applicant notes that to anticipate a claim the asserted reference must teach every element of the claim. “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the patent claim; *i.e.* every element of the claimed invention must be literally present, arranged as in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Therefore, all claim elements, and their limitations, must be found in the prior art reference to maintain the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. §102. Applicant respectfully submits that Jokipii does not teach every element of independent Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9 and 11 in the requisite detail and therefore fails to anticipate Claims 1-12.

Moreover, Jokipii has not been shown to teach or suggest a calendar application, as claimed. The Examiner appears to acknowledge that Jokipii does not teach the claimed calendar application by asserting that a gaming application acts as a calendar application. However, this assertion is unsupported as there is no indication in Jokipii that the online gaming system and/or its interface operates as a calendar application for storing personal appointments. This assertion fails to identify correspondence to the claimed limitations in as complete detail as is contained in the claim as required by the court in *Richardson*. Without a presentation of correspondence to each of the claimed limitations, the §102(e) rejection is improper, and Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

In addition, dependent Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10 and 12 depend from independent Claims 1, 5, 9 and 11, respectively, and also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Jokipii. While Applicant does not acquiesce with the particular rejection to these dependent claims, the rejection is also improper for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent Claims 1, 5, 9 and 11. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of independent Claims 1, 5, 9 and 11 and any intervening claims, and recite additional features which further distinguish them from the cited reference. Therefore, the rejection of dependent Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10 and 12 is improper. Applicant accordingly requests that the §102(e) rejection be withdrawn.


With particular respect to dependent Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, it has not been shown that Jokipii teaches that a calendar item is sent or that it includes information about a server of a multiplayer game. The mere sending of a message as taught by paragraph [0034] has not been shown to correspond to the sending of a calendar item. Also, none of the messages identified in Jokipii have been shown to include information about a server. Instead it would appear that such information would not be sent as paragraph [0041] indicates that players are automatically seated at a table if they respond to a message. The asserted messages of Jokipii have not been shown to correspond to the claim limitations directed to a calendar item in the requisite detail to support a §102(e) rejection. Applicant accordingly requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (NSN.004.A1) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the undersigned attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC
8009 34th Avenue South, Suite 125
Minneapolis, MN 55425
952.854.2700

Date: July 20, 2007

By: 

Erin M. Nichols
Reg. No. 57,125